

City of Taylorsville  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes  
Tuesday – November 22, 2005 – 6:00 P.M.  
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

---

**Attendance:**

**Planning Commission**

Kristie Overson, Chair  
Ted Jensen  
Robert “Bip” Daniels  
Blaine Smith  
Angelo Calacino  
Dama Barbour  
Scott Bolton  
Joan Ruston-Carlson (Alternate)

**Community Development Staff**

Mark McGrath, Director  
Michael Maloy, City Planner  
Dan Udall, City Planner  
Nick Norris, City Planner  
Jean Gallegos, Admin Asst/Recorder

**PUBLIC:** Jack Lucas, Jim Allred, Dan Patton, Don Patton, Steven Baer, John West, Troy Honors, Jim Blunzik, Jim Pollansik, Don Adams, Mayor Janice Auger, Russ Wall

[18:39:17](#)

**WELCOME:** **Commissioner Overson** welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

**MOTION:** [18:40:50](#) **Commissioner Calacino** – Since the first item is conceptual and more for discussion and there are three other items for the work session, I recommend that we move Agenda Item #2 ahead because it is a public hearing and actual decision item.

**SECOND:** **Commissioner Daniels**

**VOTE:** All Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously and Item #2 will be heard first.

**CONDITIONAL USES**

**(Heard out of order by motion)**

- |   |
|---|
| 1. 44C05 <b><u>Jack Lucas, 1590-1632 West 6235 South</u></b> – Proposed Residential Planned Unit Development Containing 14 Units. (Conceptual) (Michael Maloy/City Planner) |
|---|

[18:57:06](#)

1.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial and images. The applicant has requested a conceptual review of this proposal on property that was recently rezoned from MD-3 Mixed Development to R-M Residential, which permits medium density residential development not to exceed 8.9 units per acre. The applicant has proposed 14 townhouses on 1.58 acres of property with a common point of access from 6235 South. The applicant has also proposed the common road to be private. Dwelling unit density of the proposed project is 8.9 units per acre, which is the maximum permitted for the property. The units will be in groups of 3 and 4 with most being front loading concepts. The grade changes between the two sites is very evident and there is a problem with walls in between the two.

**Staff Recommendation:** No Planning Commission motion is required for conceptual review, however, members of the Planning Commission are encouraged to communicate with the applicant any suggestions or concerns that should be addressed during preliminary review at a future public meeting.

1.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** [19:02:33](#) **Jack Lucas** commented that this is a 14 unit development wherein the developer is trying to replicate the dwelling heights and sizes as shown for the Winchester Overlook Development. The units will range in size from 3,000 to 3,400 square feet and most incorporate master bedrooms on the main floor, which directs the marketing towards empty nesters and senior citizens, with a price range from \$220,000 to \$250,000. He explained that the green space element is still being worked on and now encompasses

approximately 40% of the site. He asked that the Commissioners look at another project called the Highlands in Salt Lake City, to see what this one is being patterned after.

- **Commissioner Daniels** [19:05:33](#) asked for clarification on the proposed green space. **Mr. Lucas** said it would simply be landscaped areas but not necessarily a common area.
- **Commissioner Overson** felt this was a lot of units on a small piece of property and was not happy with the number of front loading garages contemplated. She said that during previous conversations with the applicant, he mentioned possibly turning at least some of the units so that the garages could be entered from the side. She was also concerned about the lack of a common area. **Mr. Lucas** agreed that the long driveway could possibly accommodate some side access garages and would look at that and advised that the area on the far corner is proposed as a common area.
- **Commissioner Calacino** [19:09:41](#) had a couple of items for discussion. One was the possible connection to the east with the way the hammerhead is laid out, saying that was fine but there was no provision for one to the north. He asked that consideration be given to that in the final design. There are still issues with the lack of usable open space, especially for a play area for visitors and having the green space tucked into the corner may not be the very best use. The developer may have to reduce the number of units to accommodate sufficient open space but could make it up by charging a little more per remaining units sold. He continued that there would probably be a wall required along the north property line and wanted to make sure that the habitable space did not encroach into the right of way with the reduction of setbacks.
- **Commissioner Barbour** [19:14:23](#) also had concerns about the lack of open space and the fact that there are no interior sidewalks and would like those included if possible. She was also not in favor of having all front entry garages.
- **Commissioner Bolton** [19:15:26](#) questioned the 40' length of the hammerhead and said it may need to be 60' to accommodate the fire department equipment turn around requirements. **Mr. Lucas** said that they may have to move it down towards the west more to be in compliance. [19:16:07](#)
- **Commissioner Jensen** [19:16:53](#) was concerned that the property owners to the north may become landlocked by this project. **Mr. Maloy** advised that they do have access off of Redwood Road and have expressed no concern to staff with losing their privacy or to being land locked due to this development.

1.3 Discussion only – no motion required.

**(Heard out of order by motion)**

2. 37C05 <b>Prolifica LLC (Ronald Daw), 1280 W. Winchester Street and 6657 S. 2400 W. –</b> Appeal Hearing of a Conditional Use Permit to Construct a Single-family Attached Residential Planned Unit Development Within an R-M Residential Zone. (Michael Maloy/City Planner)
---

[18:41:19](#)

2.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial and images. On September 13, 2005, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to grant preliminary approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) to construct a residential planned unit development (PUD) on 2.3 acres located approximately at the northeast intersection of 1300 West and Winchester Street. Following the public hearing, the applicant considered certain conditions of approval too onerous or unnecessary and appealed that to the City Council. On October 12, 2005, the City Council voted to remand the appeal back to the Planning Commission for further consideration. Conditions being appealed are:

- #4: Applicant is to calculate total net acreage of development after dedication of required public right-of-way along 1300 West and Winchester Street to verify compliance of requested development density with the attached zoning condition, which limits residential development to 11 units per acre maximum.

The applicant is essentially requesting a density bonus based on the fact that a portion of the property will be dedicated to the City for public improvements along 1300 West and Winchester Street. The dedication of property will reduce the total area of private property within the development. The

applicant has estimated that the required dedication will result in a reduction of two dwelling units. In Taylorsville, density calculations are calculated on the net area of private property and not on the gross amount prior to right-of-way dedication. Furthermore, Taylorsville City Code 13.42.040 states, "A planned unit development permit shall not be granted unless the planned unit development meets the use limitations of such districts." Based on that, a development density bonus may not be approved by the City. It is felt the appeal item is, therefore, frivolous.

- #15: Building setbacks. House portion should not be any closer than 10' to the back of curb; buildings should not be closer than 15' between structures on the sides and should not have a rear yard any less than 20'.
- #18: Development will not be permitted as a gated community. Private roadway shall not be less than 25' wide when measured from back of curb to back of curb. However, the Planning Commission recommends that the street be at least 30' wide (measured from back of curb to back of curb) and built to City standards, in case of a future request to dedicate the private road to the City.

Items 15 and 18 refer to setback requirements established by the Planning Commission during preliminary approval of the conditional use permit. Building setbacks were largely established to be consistent with prior approval given to the adjacent Winchester Overlook development, however, on September 27, 2005, the Planning Commission voted to amend the rear yard setback requirement within the Winchester Overlook project to 15 feet. Based on previous actions of the Planning Commission, it is the opinion of Staff that this condition should be amended. However, Staff recommends that the reduced setback should be contingent on approval of a site plan that includes sufficient open space and improvements, which is consistent with the Planning Commission's preliminary approval for Winchester Overlook (Signature Development).

- Item #19: Provide a perimeter fence or wall plan along the west and south property line. Design of wall or fence must be consistent with Winchester Overlook project. Wall placement along 1300 West and Winchester is to be setback five feet from the property line to provide an area for landscaping along the streetscape and is to be positioned so as to not interfere with the required clear view area as required by the City Engineer. Provide location, height and fence material specifications to be used in development for final approval by the Planning Commission.

Item #19 is the result of a misunderstanding between the Planning Commission and the applicant. The Planning Commission approved the requested 25 foot wide private roadways within the development, however, the Planning Commission encouraged the applicant to design and construct 30 foot wide roadways in the event of a future request to dedicate private roads to the City for public use and maintenance. Appeal of this item, therefore, is unnecessary.

**2.2 Staff Recommendation:** Based on the findings contained in this report, Staff recommends denial of appeal items #4 and #19 and recommends amendment of the Planning Commission's preliminary approval for Conditional Use Permit #37C05 as stated below:

#15. Building setbacks. House portion should not be any closer than 10' to the back of curb; buildings should not be closer than 15' between structures on the sides and should not have a rear yard any less than ~~20~~ 15'.

**DISCUSSION:** 18:43:57 **Mr. Maloy** reiterated the three points of appeal as being: (1) Request that density calculations be based on the gross square footage of the property before required dedication of property for right of way improvements along 1300 West and Winchester. Essentially, Staff believes that once the right of way improvements are completed and additional properties dedicated to the right of way, based on the 11 units per acre, the applicant would be required to reduce the density that was shown at the preliminary which was 22 units down to 20 units. (2) The second point was to reduce setback be reduced from 15' along the perimeter property line per yard setback. (3) Request reduction of private road widths from 30' to 25'. He restated staff's position as being that Appeal Item (1) is clearly not permitted by the zoning ordinance, even under the PUD ordinance, it does not allow a density bonus. It is based on the net area so essentially the Planning Commission does not have the authority to grant that nor does the City Council under present ordinances. Appeal Item (2), the cross section actually indicates that it is 15' from fence line, not necessarily from property line. Appeal Item (3) is actually a misunderstanding because the Planning Commission had actually approved the 25' wide roads but recommended that 30' wide private roads be considered in the event that the private roads were ever converted to public rights of way, which would be more in line with City standards for roadway development. He went on to discuss the proposal between Prolifica and Signature Development to possibly relocate the 1300 West ingress/egress point and displayed an image of what that realignment might look like as to how it would impact

the entire site and advised that it was shown only to display what it might look like should that ultimately happen. The City Attorney has given direction to the staff that business before the Planning Commission this evening is simply to hear the appeal. The possible relocation issue is not on for consideration this evening and may be discussed in the future if the applicant submits an amended request. One issue discussed with the applicant is the importance of open space. When the rear yard setback concern was resolved with Signature Development the requirement was placed for open space to offset that rear yard setback reduction. In summary, staff recommends denial of Conditions #4 and #19 as far as amending those and Condition #15 in original approval dealt with building setbacks and staff has recommended that be reduced from 20' to 15' but to clarify that it is 15' from fence line or 19' from property line. [18:49:41](#)

**Commissioner Calacino** asked if the appeal for the setback only applied to the buildings that would be adjacent to 1300 West and Winchester, to which **Mr. Maloy** advised that the request is the rear yard setback, primarily along 1300 West and Winchester but there are also some interior areas involved in the request. [18:50:34](#) **Commissioner Calacino** added that in regard to the cross section design along Winchester and 1300 West there is a clarification in that if the setback reduction is approved, the buildings abutting the east property line up against the other development and the north property against the other development, would have 15' rear yards but the setback along Winchester and 1300 West would be closer to actually 19' to the property line.

2.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** [18:51:14](#) **Jim Allred** (representing Prolifica). He advised that their recommendation was that the setback requirement should be from the property line on the open space areas and the 19' areas would include the 5' buffer Staff wants included. **Commissioner Bolton** asked if the property line was 1' behind the sidewalk, to which **Mr. Allred** asserted that was correct. [18:52:28](#)

2.4 **SPEAKING:** None.

2.5 **MOTION:** [18:53:23](#) **Commissioner Calacino** - I would make the motion that we grant the modification of Condition #15 from the preliminary approval for Application 37C05 as follows: That the rear yard of the buildings will be 15' where adjacent to the east property line of the development and north property line of the development but where the buildings abut the property line along 1300 West and Winchester, the setback for the building to the property line will be a minimum of 19', which would allow for a 15' rear yard to a fence and then 5' landscape area between fence and the back of sidewalk. Based on the findings of fact outlined this evening and clarification of the development and it appears that the applicant is in agreement with that as well **SECOND:** [18:54:22](#) **Commissioner Daniels** **Commissioner Overson** - We have a motion to approve Item #15, which is to amend it from 15' to 19' in reference to 1300 West and Winchester and 15' with regard to the east and north property lines. **Commissioner Jensen** - I would like clarification made reference Items 4 and 19. **Commissioner Calacino** - I would modify my motion to include that original Commission Item #4 from the preliminary with regard to density is moot, being that the ordinance sets the density calculation on net acreage and not gross and neither the Planning Commission nor the City Council has the right to amend that. As for Item #19 from the original Commission preliminary approval regarding the road width, Staff said correctly that the Planning Commission approved the 25' wide street as proposed by the developer but only recommended 30' to accommodate on street parking and be in line with typical minimum street rights of way, therefore, there is no issue to be discussed there or condition to be modified. [18:56:24](#) **Commissioner Daniels** - As second, I accept that modification. **VOTE:** All Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

## **WORK SESSION**

3. 23C05 <b><u>Discussion of Proposed Phasing Plan for a Residential Planned Unit Development Containing 40 Units.</u></b> (Plantation Gardens, 677 W. 4800 S.) (Dan Udall/City Planner)
--

[19:21:54](#)

3.1 **Mr. Udall** oriented on the site plan, aerial and images. The applicant desires to receive comments from the Planning Commission in regards to their proposed conceptual phasing plan, which now includes two phases. The applicant would like to move forward to build Phase 1 at this time and wants to know if the Planning Commission will accept Phase 1 before the applicant proceeds with Phase 2.

- The applicant has not received all approval letters from all applicable agencies in regards to the Jordan River and Jordan River corridor. Originally the Planning Commission stated when they continued the PUD conditional use in August 2005, that all agencies associated with the Jordan River and the Jordan River corridor will need to submit approval letters to the Planning Commission before the applicant receives approval of the project. Now the applicant is asking the Planning Commission that only those agencies associated with Phase 1 should submit their approval letters to the City.
- The applicant has delineated that Phase 1 is not located in the flood plain or wetland. However, Staff desires verification that Phase 1 is not located in the wetland. The 100-year flood plain is not located in Phase 1. The City Engineer has stated that only the following letters are needed for Phase 1: State of Utah Dept of Natural Resources, Salt Lake County Flood Control (Meander corridor and flood control), and the US Army Corps of Engineers.
- The applicant is again proposing that residential units on the northeast corner of the property are less than 100' from the Jordan River. The closest building point is 51' from the Jordan River and this does not include the 15' rear yard setback. The General Plan states that "a 100 foot minimum dimension is recommended for the parkway. Depending on site conditions, the width will vary."

3.2 **DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Jensen 19:24:13 asked if Staff was confident that all of Phase 1 is outside the flood plain and Mr. Udall advised that was not the case because a small portion of Lot #16 is within it.

3.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** Dan Patton speaking for the applicant Don Patton. 19:25:36 Mr. Patton explained they plan to build a beautiful development and will comply with all pertinent rules in order to do so. He said that all the approval letters were not in yet, that they have had discussions with the agencies but still do not have all approval letters in hand yet and that is the reason they are proposing to build in phases, with the first phase not being impacted by agency approvals. He advised that the State of Utah requires a 150' setback but have indicated that requirement can be altered through the approval process. The Corps of Engineers have designated where the wetlands are verbally but still have not furnished a written guideline. He advised that they have started improvements and clean up on the site and that there will be a great deal of open space provided. The gates to the community will be operated by remote entry, which access will be given to the appropriate emergency personnel. There will be standard width roads and sidewalks on one side of the street with a path that connects the sidewalk on the back side. Mr. Patton wanted to discuss the access point, which is not 150' away from Sunstone Road. 19:38:24 He felt it was lined up enough to be visual and be seen. They want the right to develop their property without hindrance and have worked with the City Engineer who expressed confidence in their proposal.

- Commissioner Bolton 19:43:13 asked if Phase 1 would stand alone apart from Phase 2 and Mr. Patton advised that it would. Commissioner Bolton wanted to know about storm drainage, especially if Phase 2 is not approved and Mr. Patton replied that retention would be on site, with overflow draining into the river and that he had no doubt that Phase 2 would be approved.
- Commissioner Overson 19:45:52 said that even though the focus tonight was to determine if Phase 1 is workable and not be concerned with Phase 2 at this time, the lack of written approvals for either phase is still a major concern. She was very concerned that the street does not line up with Sunstone Road like it is supposed to and that Salt Lake County Flood Control will not have appropriate access to their structures or the river. 19:48:45 Mr. Patton advised that they had discussed the easement with the County and they do not want an asphalt road there due to repair problems it would create and they want it left as is with an access gate on 4800 South. He continued on to say that moving the access would eliminate too many units. He said the whole project is being held up, including receiving the money from the bank, due to lack of permits and the permits cannot be obtained until the Planning Commission gives their approval.
- Commissioner Jensen 19:52:47 asked about the proposed location of the retention basin. Mr. Patton indicated the location on the site plan, saying it is behind the barrier wall that the County and State built in 1982, which runs along the back side of the wetland area. Currently there is a marsh there because of the retention area, which is not on purpose. It will be engineered so it will not go into the neighborhood. Commissioner Jensen wanted to know if that was already in existence then and Mr. Patton said that it was and would be included as part of Phase 1. Commissioner Jensen then asked about public access along the river. He said that while he understood the developer's concerns about public access along their project, he still was interested in assuring the public interest was preserved relative to the gated community ramifications. He encouraged Mr. Patton to accommodate public access the full length of the river to enjoy the natural area there as they walk. His concern is that once that is gone, it cannot be recovered. 19:55:18 Mr. Patton said that the path has been discussed at length. The State of Utah owns the property to the west and has no proposal to do anything with the property. In fact, no agency wants to step forward with a

plan to develop a path, including Taylorsville City. The developers do not want to assume the liability which would be incurred with such a private development. Their plan is to leave it in the natural state with no path.

- **Commissioner Calacino** [19:59:47](#) saw no problem with this request to construct this project in phases as long as Phase 1 can stand on its own merit, however, the preliminary plat must have approvals from appropriate agencies.
- **Mr. Patton** expressed disappointment that staff had not given all the information to the Commission that he had furnished them but thanked the Commission for their input.

3.3 This item was for discussion only and no motion is required.

4. 10G05 **Cottonwood Taylorsville, L.C. (Steven Baer) – 5400 South 2700 West.** Conditional Use  
Permit Planned Unit Development/General Plan Amendment Conceptual Discussion.  
(Mark McGrath/Director)

[20:06:11](#)

4.1 **Mr. McGrath** gave the presentation. On August 6, 2003, the Taylorsville City Council adopted the City Center Small Area Master Plan (CCSAMP) as an addendum to the Taylorsville City General Plan. The CCSAMP was adopted to provide vision and help guide future development at the 20 acre site located at 2700 West and 5400 South anchored by Taylorsville City Hall. The plan identifies numerous recommendations based on the following nine “guiding principles of development”: The discussion tonight will be conceptual and requires no motion.

1. Create a Community Gathering Place
2. Emphasize Quality Architecture
3. Emphasize Quality Site Design
4. Carefully Blend a Mix of Land Uses
5. Create a Strong Pedestrian Orientation
6. Create Integration Within the Site and Within the Surrounding Community
7. Embrace a Diversity of Transportation Alternatives
8. Create a District Rather Than a Shopping Center
9. Embrace the concept of “Gestalt” (i.e., the whole is greater than the sum of the individual parts).

**Mr. McGrath** continued on to say that recently Cottonwood Taylorsville, L.C. (Cottonwood Partners) entered into a contractual agreement with the City of Taylorsville to purchase 13.1 acres of the City Center site with the intent to develop a 133,000 square foot commercial center. The development as envisioned by the applicants, will potentially require a general plan amendment before proceeding with the conditional use/planned unit development process. Given that a number of existing commissioners have been appointed since the development of the CCSAMP, City Staff will update the Commission on the history of the site and the plan, then introduce the development proposal, identify concerns and let the development team describe their project in greater detail.

For tonight, Staff is proposing the following conceptual discussion outline:

1. Brief City Center Small Area Master Plan Summary (Staff)
2. Brief Presentation of the Development Proposal (Staff).
3. City Center Small Area Master Plan Analysis (Staff).
4. Community Development Department Position (Staff).
5. Detailed Presentation of the Development Proposal and Master Plan Amendment Requests (Development Team).
6. Discussion (Planning Commission, Development Team, Staff).

#### 4.2 **DISCUSSION:**

- **Commissioner Calacino** [20:15:32](#) asked if it were correct that the developer wanted to increase the parking ratios to 5 per thousand up from 4 per thousand in the original plan, which **Mr. McGrath** said was correct. [20:16:12](#)
- **Commissioner Daniels** [20:17:22](#) wanted to know why there were no handicap spaces identified and **Mr. McGrath** said that they just had not been shown on the drawing yet. [20:17:55](#) **Commissioner Daniels** asked about other forms of transportation being included. **Mr. McGrath** said that there are plans for a bicycle route as well as future mass transit, possibly even light rail but a higher rider-ship

rate must be shown in order to attract that possibility. **Commissioner Daniels** was concerned about that many parking stalls possibly creating a detrimental heat island.

- **Commissioner Overson** commented that the original plan included potential for housing to be included in the proposal, also two story structures. **Mr. McGrath** said the current proposal does not include housing nor two story structures, with the exception of one building.
- **Mr. McGrath** said that staff's primary concern is the orientation of the buildings, feeling it was very important to have street orientation and did not feel having the backs of the buildings facing the street would meet the intent of the original proposal and general plan. This proposal does not facilitate the community gathering atmosphere the original plan intended. He felt, however, that the City is lucky to be working with this design team and with a few minor changes, felt this could be an acceptable project. [20:24:16](#)

4.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS/PRESENTATION:** John West (Owner of Cottonwood Taylorsville, L.C.), Steven Baer (Senior Project Manager), Troy Honors and Jim Blunzik (Architects) [20:27:05](#).

1. **Troy Honors** [20:39:35](#) agreed that the building orientation was a major change from the original plan but that the rear of the building would be designed so as not to look like a rear entrance. However, the primary entrances would be from the parking area and that Centennial Way would be the main focus for the gathering place proposal. There were five leasable areas intended with 4.9 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of retail space. That shared parking is a given and the spaces around City Hall have not been included in the percentages shown.
2. [20:52:39](#) **Commissioner Smith** asked if the business hours would be staggered and **Mr. Baer** said that would be market-driven.
3. **Commissioner Barbour** commented that she was excited by this proposal and asked if it would be built in phases. [20:53:59](#) **Mr. Baer** said that also would be market driven. That they presently have three tenants expressing interest.
4. **Commissioner Daniels** [20:54:26](#) expressed the opinion that people want to be able to walk or drive up and not have to go around the building to enter. He asked the architect to speak further on how the back/front design of the buildings would be handled. **Mr. Honors** said that he may have spoken premature on that issue. These issues will be tenant driven and some may prefer two entrances. The primary entrances are proposed to be directly off of the parking area. [20:55:38](#) **Mr. Baer** added that people in general want to have direct access. For instance to enter their insurance company office and to patronize food shops where clientele take food out or dine on the patio. They have one large restaurant to have expressed interest that would be a key draw to the project.
5. **Commissioner Jensen** [20:58:36](#) expressed concern about the proposed festival area and felt the traffic islands would make it very hazardous for pedestrian traffic. [20:59:13](#) **Mr. Adams** felt the islands would be useful as a storage and staging area for events such as a farmer's market. **Commissioner Jensen** [21:00:37](#) asked the applicant how they would handle the agreement made with the Namba Family at the time of purchase of the entire site and **Mr. Baer** said they were aware of that agreement but have not had a chance to fully address the issues therein. That area would be a significant entry into the project and the City has worked out a corridor agreement with UDOT and hopefully there will be a traffic signal installed there. The water retention will be underground and appropriate landscaping will be used in conjunction with that. [21:01:23](#)
6. **Commissioner Calacino** [21:01:45](#) In regards to access to the building, he still had issue with the main entrance coming from the parking lot. He preferred to see dual frontage and let the tenants choose their main entrance. **Mr. Baer** again addressed the parking ratios and **Commissioner Calacino** suggested focusing on average daily traffic and wanted the developer to consider designing the building where the tenant can choose one way or the other where they want their front door and not just automatically have the entrance from the parking lot.
7. **Mr. Adams** [21:05:54](#) commented that they had talked to a lot of operators and typically found that the average retail tenant only wants to look at one door, one cash register, one security point in and out, however, that there is some flexibility. At this point the City and developer are not in a position to demand a lot in this development due to the fact that Taylorsville is a suburban community. We have a suburbanized center here with minimal angle parking on a public street that will not get a lot of

attention. The best thing to understand is to design with some limited options but the tenants interested in leasing here are telling the City that they prefer one entrance. The goal is to have a successful workable development rather than a very pretty empty development.

8. **Mr. Baer** [21:08:58](#) advised that he understood Commissioner Calacino's concern but CRG, who is part of the development team, said the only way they would take the project was with the present orientation.
9. **Commissioner Barbour** [21:24:15](#) commented that while she felt the small area master plan for the City center was a good document, she also is aware of the importance of visibility to prospective tenants. She was concerned that the connection to Bent Nail Road in the subdivision to the north was eliminated but had received numerous calls from neighbors who did not want through traffic there. She asked how wide the walkways throughout the center would be and **Mr. Baer** replied they would be 8' to 12' wide on average, with some being 6' wide. **Commissioner Barbour** complimented the developer on the proposed gathering area, public restrooms and water feature and felt the issue of dual entrances was a security issue.
10. **Commissioner Daniels** [21:29:03](#) asked that someone address the elimination of the two story structures. **Mr. Baer** said that the two story structures would only target a minimal amount of tenants and the tight parking ratio made it unworkable.
11. **Commissioner Overson** [21:30:57](#) said she was excited about this proposal and said she was one of those people who want to park as close to an entrance as possible, so was supporting of the primary entrance being from the parking lot but wanted to make sure the architecture of the buildings was 360 degrees so it would look equally nice from all views. She understood why neighbors did not want vehicular traffic from the City Center accessing through their subdivision but was in favor of at least a walkway entrance there. [21:32:11](#)
12. **Commissioner Jensen** [21:36:17](#) was concerned about access throughout the center and did not want it to turn out like the MidValley Center. He wanted to make sure that bus access would be accommodated.
13. **Commissioner Calacino** [21:37:51](#) felt the plan was positive but wanted the City and developers to think towards the future. He was concerned about the status quo and what the current market demands could significantly change quickly and doom a project. He wanted more consideration given to pedestrian activity and mass transit and not to get stuck on parking ratio numbers. He also recommended the buildings be designed with 360 degree architecture, at least adding windows on the street side which would eventually be replaced easily with a door should the need arise and to at least look at a pedestrian access to the subdivision to the north.
14. **Commissioner Smith** [21:41:11](#) was pleased with the presentation and advised he was looking forward to seeing it develop.
15. **Mr. Baer** [21:41:39](#) thanked the Commission for their comments and advised they would try to be back with preliminary review on January 10, 2006.

#### 4.3 Discussion only – no motion required.

5. <b>Case Study Presentation of Lake View Village, Lake Oswego, Oregon.</b> (Mark McGrath/Director)
--

5.1 **Mr. McGrath** made a slide presentation and discussed some ideas gleaned from this project which could possibly be incorporated into the City Center proposal. [21:43:25](#)

**ADJOURNMENT:** By motion of **Commissioner Calacino** and second by **Commissioner Barbour**, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m. [22:12:24](#)

Respectfully submitted by:

---

Jean Gallegos, Admin Assistant to the  
Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on December 13, 2005.